Remarks

Claims 5, 9, 14, 17 and 19 are amended and claims 20 to 25 are added. Claims 1 to 25 are pending in this application of which claims 1, 5, 9, 17, 19, 20 and 21 are in independent form.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge that claims 5 to 7, 9, 10 and 17 to 19 contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claims 5, 9, 17 and 19 are amended to incorporate therein all the features and limitations of the claims from which they had depended. Claims 6 and 7 are dependent from claim 5 and claims 10 and 18 are dependent from claims 9 and 17, respectively. Accordingly, claims 5 to 7, 9, 10 and 17 to 19 should now be in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Mizoguchi et al. The following will show that claim 1 patentably distinguishes the invention over this reference.

The adjusting device of Mizoguchi et al permits a movement of the optical end elements only in the x-direction but not in the y-direction. In contrast to Mizoguchi et al, applicants' claim 1 includes the feature and limitation of:

> "an adjusting device attached to said frame for variably changing the position of said optical end element substantially in a plane parallel to said viewing field of said user." (emphasis added)

As seen above, the applicants' optical end element must be movable in two direction in order that it be movable in a plane. This is not possible in Mizoguchi et al because only a linear movement along a straight line is possible with the apparatus of IUL-05-2005 18:35 WALTER OTTESEN 301 869 8929 P.13

this reference. This can be especially seen in FIG. 4 of Mizoguchi et al wherein the ocular end element 47 is shown movable only back and forth by the double arrow. Accordingly, Mizoguchi et al cannot achieve the applicants' object of providing a head-mounted optical visualization system which is adaptable with respect to the anatomical and optical characteristics of the user as well as adaptable with respect to an instantaneous task-required primary viewing direction of the user as noted at the top of page 2, of the applicants' disclosure. This is so, because Mizoguchi et al is greatly limited as the movement is restricted to be along a single line as opposed to a plane as set forth above in applicants' claim 1.

The applicants have reviewed Mizoguchi et al and have found no suggestion from which our person of ordinary skill could hit upon the idea of moving the optical end element in a plane as required by applicants' claim 1. Accordingly, it is not seen how Mizoguchi et al could anticipate or even render obvious the applicants' invention so that claim 1 should now patentably distinguish the application over Mizoguchi et al and be allowable.

With respect to applicants' claim 4, it is noted that the applicants' deflecting device is adaptable with reference to the desired magnitude of the virtual image provided ahead of the eye of the user by the optical deflecting device.

In Mizoguchi et al, an increase in magnitude is achieved in that the LCD display panel is variable in its position. In this connection, please see FIGS. 5 and 10 of this reference as well as column 8, starting at line 54, where it is noted:

JUL-05-2005 18:35 WALTER OTTESEN 301 869 8929 P.14

"...According to the vertical movement of the LCD holder 43, a spacing between the LCD 45, the reflector plate 48 and the ocular lens 47 is changed for allowing a user to focus an image present on the LCD according to preference."

Thus, and in contrast to the applicants' invention, the optical deflecting device in Mizoguchi et al is fixedly mounted with its reflector plate 48. This can be seen also in FIG. 5 of this reference where the lower edge of the reflector plate 48 is shown extending below a projection of the frame 41. A lifting of the mirror is prevented thereby. In addition, even if the mirror 48 could be lifted, a lifting thereof in FIG. 5 would lead to the situation that the viewer A would see the interior workings of visual unit 40 where the removed reflector plate can no longer deflect the view of the viewer.

In contrast to Mizoguchi et al, the mirror of the optical deflecting device of the applicants' invention is adaptable which makes greater values possible with respect to adjusting with a view to a desired magnitude.

Claim 11 is dependent from claim 1 and discloses that the optical deflecting device includes an optical end element and an optical lens system. The optical lens system is shown in FIG. 1 wherein its elements are identified by reference numerals (126, 126'; 128, 128'). Here it can be seen that the optical end element is not the same as the optical lens system. Stated otherwise, the optical lens system is an additional feature.

Mizoguchi et al discloses an optical end element but not a supplementing optical lens system.

Claim 22 is added to recite that the optical lens system

JÜL-Ø5-2005 18:35 WALTER OTTESEN 301 869 8929 P.15

lies outside of the viewing field of the user. The antecedent basis for this claim can be found at the bottom of page 6 of the applicants' disclosure.

Claim 23 is added to emphasize that both the deflecting element and the lens system are built into the closed housing outside of the viewing field of the user.

Claim 14 is amended to recite only that the optical deflecting device is releasably attached to the frame. This is not the situation in Mizoguchi et al so that this reference cannot anticipate applicants' claim 14 as suggested in the action.

Claim 24 is added to recite that the optical deflecting device is tiltably attached to the frame. Also, claim 25 is added to recite that the optical deflecting device is tiltably attached to the frame so as to be easily displaceable out of the viewing field of the user.

The dependent claims 2 to 4, 8, 11 to 16 and 22 to 25 are even farther away from Mizoguchi et al than claim 1 so that they too should now be allowable.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi et al in view of Rallison et al. Applicants will now show that claim 12 also patentably distinguishes their invention over this combination of references.

Rallison et al discloses a tracker for analyzing head movements and this tracker is held at the back of the head. What is special with respect to the solution disclosed in this reference is, however, that the viewing direction and viewing

depth of the user are tracked. This can take place also for a head at standstill. The detecting features in the applicants' invention are configured to be far more finer, that is, the smallest eye movements and pupil changes are detected and this is not disclosed in Rallison et al. Accordingly, it is not possible for our artisan to combine Rallison et al with Mizoguchi et al to arrive at the applicants' invention by exercising only ordinary skill.

Applicants have shown that claim 1 is not anticipated by Mizoguchi et al and that this claim patentably distinguishes the invention thereover. The remaining claims 2 to 4, 8, 11 to 16 and 22 to 25 are all dependent from claim 1. Accordingly, these claims too should now be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter Ottesen

Reg. No. 25,544

Walter Ottesen
Patent Attorney
P.O. Box 4026
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20885-4026

Phone: (301) 869-8950

Date: July 5, 2005

;

JUL-05-2005 18:36

WALTER OTTESEN

301 869 8929

P.17

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER:

JUL 0 5 2005

	IIder Use Pederwo PATENT AT	Approved for use through 19/31/2002 (MD 0651-063 that and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE on of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number Application or Docket Number 10/750,958								
CLAIMS AS FILED - PART I (Cotumn 1) (Cotumn 2)						SMALL ENTITY OR SMALL ENTITY				
OR			NUMBER FILED		NUMBER EXTRA		FEE		RATE	FEE
BASIC FEE			建筑和 的人。1965年			4.	s	OR		s <u>770</u>
TOTAL CLAIMS G7CFR (.16(c))		19	19 minus 20 • •		• 0			OR	x\$=	
INDE	PENDENT CLA	IMS 1	minu	• ()	x=		OR	x=	
MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM PRESENT (37 CFR 1.14(4))						+		OR	·	
■ If the difference in column 1 is less then zero, enter "0" in column 2 ———————————————————————————————————						TOTAL		OR	TOTAL	770
CLAIMS AS AMENDED - PART II (Column I) (Column 2) (Column 3)						SMALL EI	MIITY	OR	OTHER TI	
AMENDMENT A		CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE		RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE
	Total (27 CFR 1.16(e))	* 25	Minus	** 20	= 5	x \$=		OR OR	x s_50_	250
	Independent (37 CPR 1.16(b))	* 7	Minus	*** 3	- 4	×		OR	× <u>200</u> =	800
	FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM (37 CFR 1.16(4))					+=		OR	+	
		(Column I)		(Column 2)	(Column 3)	TOTAL ADDIT. FEE		OR	TOTAL DDIT. FEB	1,050
AMENDMENT B		CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE		RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE
	Total	•	Minus	**	3	x \$=		OR	x \$=	
	Independent (37 CFR 1.16(b))	•	Minus	***	=	x=		OR OR	x=	<u> </u>
					(37 CFR 1.16(d))	·=		OR	- <u>-</u> -	
	(Column 1) (Column 2) (Column 3)							OR	TOTAL ADDIT. FEB	<u></u>
AMENDMENT C	ind in the second	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEC		RATE	ADDI- TIONAL FEE
	Total (37 CFR 1.16(e))	•	Minus	**	-	x S=		OR OR	x S=	
	Independent (37 CFR 1.16(b))	•	Minus	***	8	x=		OR	×=	
	FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM (37 CFR 1.16(4))					·		OR	<u>+</u>	*
_	f the entry in column 1 is less than the entry in column 2, write "0" in column 3. f the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, enter "20".					TOTAL ADDIT, FEE		OR	TOTAL ADDIT, FEB	